

The ostanik's in Ancient Armenia

(in Connection with the Question of Forms of Land Ownership)

by Anahit Perikhanian

The original Russian of this article (*Drevnearmyanskies vostoniki*) was published in the journal *Vestnik drevnei istorii* [*Bulletin of Ancient History*], #2(1956) pp. 44-58. The present English translation was made by Robert Bedrosian, and published on the Internet in 2019.

[44]

Among Armenian authors of the 5th century, one repeatedly encounters references to an apparently widespread group of individuals, the so-called *ostanik's*. For clarification of the social position of the *ostanik's* in the slave-holding society of ancient Armenia (to and including the 3rd century A.D.), Armenian sources, taken by themselves, provide very little information; consequently, one should attempt to clarify this question with the help of parallel material from Parthian Iran and the Seleucid state.

Ostanik' is a term of Iranian origin deriving from *wostan* (compare Pers. *ōstān*). Iranian *ōstān* signifies "gate, threshold, royal palace, court," but also has technical meanings which shall be discussed later.

N. Adontz (1) understood the *ostan* of Armenia as the "royal court" and equated *ostan* with *curtis dominicalis* of Medieval Europe. According to his view, the *ostan* was the center of *naxarar* ["lordly"] and/or royal land, while the term *ostanik'* was identical to the Russian term *dvorianin* ["nobleman"]. In Adontz' opinion, the expression *ostan ark'uni* ["*ostan* of the king"] already encountered in P'awstos, implied that there must have existed another, non-royal, *ostan*. Actually, references to *ostans* of the princes Kamsarakan, Artsruni, and Bagratuni are found among the Armenian historians, but these relate to the [later] feudal period, when *naxarar* landholding had become greatly strengthened and the political importance and independence of the important *naxarar* families had grown, especially after the collapse of royal power in Armenia. Under these circumstances, there is nothing surprising about the fact that the centers of *naxarar* power also came to be styled *ostans*, by analogy with the royal *ostan*.

A different view was held by H. Hübschmann (2), who believed that *ostan* in the 4th century A.D. designated the land or city directly subject to the Arsacid king. Hübschmann was followed by H. A. Manandyan, to whom the *ostans* in Armenia meant royal estates [45], lands, and cities. As regards the *ostanik's*, Manandyan was inclined to see them as vassal landowners on royal land (1). H. Hübschmann's and H. A. Manandyan's treatment of the term *ostan* as "royal holding" fully comports with the information of the sources, according to which not only were the royal residences of Artashat, Tigranakert, Vagharshapat (and later Dwin) named *ostan*, but so were the district of Ayrarat and royal lands throughout the entire country.

N. Adontz—considering his explanation of the term *ostan* as "royal court, palace, residence" to be the only correct and possible explanation—found support for his viewpoint in the statement of P'awstos (IV.19) about the fact that king Arshak II [350-c.364/367] deprived the Kamsarakans of their clan districts and confiscated these districts (*gawar'k'*) in punishment. The latter act is expressed in P'awstos by the words *ew zgawar'sn une'r yostan* "and the districts were taken in/to [the] *ostan*." Disputing H. Manandyan, N. Adontz (2) maintained that if *ostan* designated "royal holding" then the text would have read *zgawar'sn yostan ar'ner* "he made the districts *ostan*." However reasonable may be the broader understanding of the term in question (namely to designate "royal holding" generally, and particularly combined with the verb *unel* ["to have, to take"] used by P'awstos) it is difficult not to compare it with another expression which employs the clearly Armenian term *ark'unik'*. Parallel with the expression cited from P'awstos, there existed another expression having the equivalent meaning which was already in use, namely *yark'unis unel* "to take for the court," which employs the same verb and the

same construct. In context it is impossible to interpret these terms to mean "royal palace," since the text speaks about immovable land, territories, or villages not located directly near the royal court or residence. There can be no doubt that both the first and the second expression refer not to a palace, but rather to the transformation [of land] into royal, state property under the full control of the royal administration.

Ostan, meaning "royal land" also existed in Arsacid Iran as a territorial conception. This may be deduced indirectly. The first Sasanid king, Artashir [224/26-240/41] eliminated the autonomy of the district of Μησηνή [Mēsēnē] (Iran. Mēshān, in the Basra area), overthrew the local ruler, and turned the district into a royal province under the name *ōstān shād i Bahman* (3). Clearly, Artashir in naming a district directly subject to royal administration "*ostan*" was using this term with a meaning established before his time. To Ibn Khordabih, the Holwān area in the Sasanian period consisted of the *ōstān shād i Peroz* with five *tasuks*. Mesopotamia (Iran. Sūristan) consisted of twelve *ostans* (4).

The *Geography* of Anania Shirakats'i [an Armenian work of the 7th century] (5) mentions *ostan* as an administrative-territorial unit, a district in the Sasanid state. Describing the Elamites, Shirakats'i wrote: "they possess five *ostans*, that is, districts (*ashxarhk'*) ["lands"] in which the following cities are located..."

[46]

In Parthian Manichaean texts, this term is encountered in the form '*wyst'm*, meaning "province" (1). In the *Sasanian Law-Book*, the *Mātikān i hazār dādestān* [MHD], this term is encountered several times and signifies a royal, as opposed to a temple, holding. MHD, XLII, 51 (2):

A39, 8—11:

Ut ani guft (9) kū āturān bandak (i) āzātīh ī pat mart rāδ pat āturān bandakīh (ī) hač šāhikān bē dāt (10) pat vināskārīh ī xvēš dehpatān ō ōstān ōh kart ut hač ōstān ō yut (11) ātaxš ōh dāt.

A39, 8—11:

It is also said that: for the commission of a crime a *hierodulos* — who is made free (lit.: "is given into freedom") by the royal treasury as regards other (private) persons (= who has the status of a freeman before men — *A. P.*) but a slave as regards Fire-(temples) — is formally transferred ("assigned, appointed") by the rulers to the royal *ōstān* (to perform his labour service as a punishment there — *A. P.*) and from the *ōstān* he is transferred to another Fire-temple.

In this article, the text describes the punishment facing a hierodule who is delivered to the royal holding/estate where the exploitation of slave labor was, apparently, more cruel than on temple estates.

As is clear from the following article, the transfer of a temple slave to [a term of labor on] a royal estate lasted for several years (3). MHD, XLII, 52:

A39, 11—17:

Apāk ani (guft kū) ka ōy bay Vahrām šāhān šāh Yazdkartān Mihr(12)Narseh ī vazurg framātār pat bandakīh (ō) ātaxš ī Artvahišt ut ātaxš ī Aβzōn-(13)Artaxšahr dāt čand sāl pat ān dāt pat āturān dāšt ut pas pat framān ī (14) ōy bay Yazdkart šāhān šāh ī Vahrāmān ut nām ī vināskārīh apāč ō ōstān (15) kart (ut) čand sāl pat ōstān dāšt ut pas ōy bay Pērōž šāhān šāh pat ham(16)pursakīh ī Martbūt (ī) magupatān magupat būt ut apārik dastaβarān ī mat ēstāt (17) hend pat bandakīh nē ō ham ātaxš (ī) bē ō ātaxš ī Ōhrmizd-Pērōž dāt.

A39, 11—17:

It is also said, that when (our) late sovereign Vahrām, King of Kings son of Yazdkart, conveyed the *vazurg-framātār* Mihr-Narsēh as a slave (= a *hierodulos*; lit. “into slavery” — *A. P.*) to the Artvahišt Fire-temple and the Aβzōn-Artaxšahr Fire-temple, then, in accordance with this transfer he (= Mihr-Narsēh) stayed (“was kept”) at the (above)mentioned Fire temples for several years; then, at the order of his late majesty Yazdkart, King of Kings son of Vahrām, he was taken to the *ōstān* for a crime/an offence, and he was in the *ōstān* during the course of several years (*cf. supra* A39, 8—11, *et infra* A40, 1—3, A40, 3—6 — *A. P.*); and subsequently he was conveyed into slavery by his late majesty Pērōz, King of Kings, with the consent of the *magupatān-magupat* Martbūt and other authorities who were present [lit.: “who appeared” (evidently at the royal council that settled the question of Mihr-Narsēh) — *A. P.*], but not to the same Fire temple, but to the Ōhrmizd-Pērōz Fire-temple.

The two remaining articles of the *Mātikān* which mention *ostan* have the same general content. MHD, XLII, 53 (4):

A40, 1—3:

Ut anī guft (kū ka gōβēt) kū-m āturān bandakīh [vinās]ih(?) ī pat pit ut šōy rāδ⁺ (Ms.: L'-nē) vindāt ka xvāt (2) avinās ađak-ič pat vināskārīh ī pit ut šōy pat framān ī dehpatān ō ōstān (ōh)?(3) kart.

A40, 1—3:

It is also said, that if she declares (the following) “I have obtained the *hierodulē* (= the status of a *hierodulē*) as a consequence of [an offence]? committed by (my) father and husband”, then even if she herself is innocent, (she) is formally transferred (“assigned”) to the *ōstān* by the rulers because of the offence of (her) father or husband.

MHD, XLII, 54:

A40, 3—6:

Apāk anī Mihr-Narseh⁺ hač zan ut rahīk ham(m)is pat āturvaxših ut bandakī[h] (4) ut paristārīh [91] bē dāt (...) vināskārīh ī zan ut rahīk čiš nē nimūt <ut> zan-ič ut rahi[k] (5) ō ōstān kart ēn dāstān apāk vičīr ī pat-ič (bē) Dandān ut Āturtōxm ham moyān⁺ (6) (h)andarzpāt kart (ut)? hačapar nipišt ēstēt nikerītan.

[47]

A40, 3—6:

And again (the following). Mihr-Narsēh together with (his) wife and slave were conveyed (to a temple) for their respective performance of the duties of *āturvaxš* [92], slave and *hierodulē*. ... (And even though) nothing pointed to any offence of the wife or the slave, both the wife and slave were also sent to the *ōstān* (= the royal domain/the royal household).

This decision should be examined together with the decision taken by the already mentioned *handarzpāt* of the Magi with regard to Dandān and Āturtōxm (and) concerning which it was written above (*cf. supra* A37, 1—15) [93].

We do not, however, exclude the possibility that there may be a somewhat different meaning for the term *ōstān* in the articles cited in the *Mātikān*, namely, the term may have been used to designate the central administration *as such*, in contradistinction, in the given case, to temple administration. In such a situation, temple slaves,

having committed one or another crime, were placed at the disposal of the central powers (of the district or of its subdivision), which exploited or punished these slaves at its discretion.

Thus in the Iranian milieu, whence this term passed to Armenia, the term *ōstān* was used not only for designating the royal residence, but also and more frequently, was applied as a technical term for a much broader concept: royal land, district, royal holding/farm, or the central administration in general.

In Iran, control over Χώρα βασιλική [*chōra basilikē*, "royal land"] was exercised through special administrators of the royal land, the *ōstāndārs*. The *ōstāndār* oversaw royal holdings extending over a very significant territory, sometimes an entire large district. We know of *ōstāndārs* of Arvastan (residing in Nisibis—see below), Ispahan (2) and Tabaristan (3).

In DPg10, dated 121/122 A.D., which was published by Rostovtzeff and Welles (4), the title of an important Parthian official, Manes, son of Phraat, is cited (lines 4-5): ... τῶν παρὰ Μανῆσου τοῦ Φραάτου τῶν βατησα καὶ τ[ῶν.....] ροῦ, παρ[...]_{του} καὶ στρατηγοῦ Μεσοποταμίας καὶ Παραποταμίας καὶ Ἀραβάρχου (*tōn para Manēsou tou Phraatou tōn batesa kai t[ōn.....]ron, par [...] tou kai stratēgou Mesopotamias kai Parapotamias kai arabarchou*). Manes was a *bdes*_h, satrap of Mesopotamia and Parapotamia, and the *arabarkh*. The lacuna, coming at the end of the 4th and the beginning of the 5th line, whose contents name a second office of this person, contained about 9-10 letters. M. I. Rostovtzeff (*op. cit.*, pp. 11 and 51) reconstructed it -τ[ῶν ἐλευθέ]ρων (*t[ōn eleuthe]ron*), as a translation of Iranian *āzātān*, "free, noble." Rostovtzeff's reconstruction provoked a deserved objection from V. Ensslin (5). Actually, it would be odd to underline membership in the *āzāt* class of so highly-placed an individual as Manes and the more so to state this in an official document before stating that Manes was a *strategoi*. V. Ensslin sees in him a member of the Parthian state council, and proposes the connective τ[ῶν συν/γενῶν ἀνδ]ρῶν (*t[ōn sun/genōn and]rōn*). But, in the first place, such a reconstruction, comprising 13 letters, would be difficult to fit into the lacunae; secondly, J. Wolski (6) has turned his attention on this and has suggested to Ensslin that the term is always written simply οἱ συγγενεῖς [*oi suggeneis*]. J. Wolski would fill the lacuna as follows: τῶν βατησα καὶ [αὐτοκρατῶ]ρων (*tōn batēsa kai [autokrato]ron*), though there is no need to reject the letter τ, traces of which Rostovtzeff detected in the document, especially since the article [48] here is appropriate for the grammatical construction. J. Wolski supports his conjecture by citing examples of the title αὐτοκράτωρ [*autokrator*] used by some Parthian kings, copied from the Roman *imperator*. However, this still does not address the possibility of the same title being used for an official. On the contrary, it excludes such a possibility; for it is difficult to imagine that within one and the same government the king *and* an official personage would be similarly titled. Moreover, the Parthian king was given several such namesakes, since in the parchment the term used is in the plural. J. Wolski suggests further that use of the title αὐτοκράτωρ [*autokrator*] by the Palmyran Odenates testifies to the great spread of this title in the East in the 3rd century of our era. Furthermore, as is known, Odenates was co-ruler of the Roman emperor Gallien in the East. On coins of his son Vaballat, one finds the legend *im(perator) d(ux) R(omanorum)* = αὐτ[οκράτωρ] (*aut[ocrator]*) σ[τρατηγός] (*s[tratēgos]*). Zonares and Syncelles state that Gallien made Odenates head of the entire East and, in *SHA* [*Historia Augusta*], *Vita Gallieni*, 10, it says about Odenates that he *obtenuit totius Orientis imperium*, by which was understood all the Asiatic provinces and Egypt. Odenates, after the Persian campaign, was officially declared *imperator* (compare *SHA*, Trig. Tyr., XV, 6). Thus Odenates' αὐτοκράτωρ was a direct Greek translation of the Roman title *imperator*, which [title] he officially bore in his capacity of supreme Roman commander in the East, and co-ruler of the *imperators* (1). Thus it is clear that Odenates' case constitutes more an exception than the rule and application to a Parthian official is inappropriate.

Mesopotamia (Sūristān) in the Parthian period was a country of important royal landholds, a situation which, doubtlessly, was reflected in the administrative-territorial division of this region under the Sasanians into 12 *ostans*. Therefore, it is natural to propose that one of Manes' titles was *ōstāndār* (2), and to restore the lacuna as ...τῶν βατησα καὶ τ[ῶν ὀστανδά]ρων (*tōn batēsa kai t[ōn ostanda]ron*) (3). Such a restoration perfectly fits the size of the lacuna. The convergence of the offices of *bdes*_h and of ruler of the *ostan* in one person took place, evidently, to avoid a great fragmentation of power in strategically important border provinces, and to strengthen centralization. It has its analogy in Arsacid Armenia.

P'awstos (IV.50) states that king Arshak (4th century A.D.) was faced with rebellion from the *bdeshtx* of Aghdznik' (Arzanene) and the *bdeshtx* of Noshirakan who also ruled the districts of Mahkert-tun, Nikhorakan, and Dasn (1). According to Agat'angeghos, the district of Mahkert-tun was an *ostan*. Likewise subject to the *bdeshtx* of Arzanene were the *ostans* of Arzn, Tigranakert, and Angegh-tun (see below). Characteristically, all these districts headed by the two *bdeshtxs* were on the borders and formed southern Armenia's strategic barrier (2).

If our proposal for DPg10 is acceptable, then we may speak not only about indirect, but about direct, testimony confirming the existence of the *ostan*—Χώρα βασιλική [*chōra basilikē*]*—*in Parthian Iran.

Thus it is possible to suggest that in Armenia in the period of interest to us, as well as in Iran (whence, properly speaking, this term penetrated into Armenia), *ostan* was a term equivalent to Greek Χώρα βασιλική, having in addition some other technical meanings of similar scope.

In this period four types of landholding existed in Armenia: royal, temple (3), city (4), and *naxarar*. For our immediate concerns, it is necessary to touch on the reciprocal situation of royal and *naxarar* landholding. A general idea of the correlation between royal and *naxarar* landholding and the evolution of this correlation is especially important because the picture of the situation obtaining toward the beginning of the 5th century A.D. very often is mechanically transferred backward in time to a much earlier century—all the way back to the time of Tigran II [1st century B.C.], creating an unreliable idea about general lines of development.

The *naxarardom*—one of the most ancient institutions of government rule—passed through a long evolution. In the 4-5th centuries, when the feudal structure in Armenia was already formed, the *naxarars* were important feudals, hereditary rulers of whole districts, in vassal dependence on the king. The general number of *naxarar* clans/families in Marzpan Armenia reached 70, judging from the *Gahnamak* (a 5th-century document of ranks). In all, if we include Western Armenia, which had passed to the Byzantine empire, there would have been about 100 clans. However, this is but the final glimpse of this institution. Originally, the men styled *naxarars* were those people appointed by the king as rulers of districts, or governors (5).

The term *naxarar* is a Parthian loan word and its definitive etymology was recently established by W. Henning (old Arm. *naxarar* corresponds exactly to Parthian *naxwādar* [50] "he who holds primacy; [holds] the first place; overseer," Armenian -axa < -axwa- compare Arm. *kaxard* on the basis of a recently-discovered inscription from southern Khorasan (1). This inscription (dated ca. the 3rd century A.D.) appears with a signature under a chiseled drawing, and is read by Henning gry'rthštr nhwdr W ḥštrp (2). According to his reading, these titles are equivalents and the term *naxwādar* apparently had circulation in the northern (Parthian-language) regions, just as "satrap" had circulation in the southern regions (3). The same title also figures in a pre-Christian Syrian inscription (ca. 3rd cent. A.D.) from a grotto in Sogmatar (around Harran); in it, the son of the toparch of the district 'Arab (Arvastan) is styled "*naxadar* (of the district) Shud or Shur (*nohdara dṣ Šūd/r*)" (4).

Arsacid *naxadars*, or satraps, differed greatly from their Achaemenid predecessors by the size of the territories subject to them, and, consequently, by the extent of [their] power within the government. Parthian satraps were several orders of magnitude below the Achaemenid ones; they were not so cumbersome and artificial, as the Achaemenid ones were and possibly coincided with the former Seleucid eparchs (5). About the extent of the Parthian satrapies we may judge from the *Itinerary* of Isidore of Charax (1st cent. B.C.) in which 19 satrapies are enumerated. The list is far from complete since Isidore mentions only those satrapies through which the royal highways he described passed. The satrapies themselves were divided into hyparchies: one of the latter, Bayseyry, is mentioned in an Avroman parchment (6).

[51]

Pliny provides information about the administrative-territorial division of Armenia: "Armenia is subdivided into 120 prefectures having barbarous names, which are called *strategies*; some of them at one time, were even separate kingdoms" (1). As N. Adontz established, the prefectures (*strategies*) of Pliny corresponded to the Armenian *gawar'k'*, "large districts", "cantons." In the *Geography* of Anania Shirakats'i, where Armenia is considered within the same boundaries as in Pliny, up to 185 such districts are enumerated. Some of these divisions arose later, and the discovery among them of the 120 ancient districts is not very difficult; the more so, since Strabo, Pliny, and Ptolemy mention more than 50 place names (2).

It is interesting to note that Movse's Xorenats'i (II.7) attributes the introduction of the institution of the *naxarardoms* to the reforms of the first Armenian Arsacid king, a contemporary of Pliny. According to Xorenats'i, the *naxarardoms* existed in the pre-Arsacid period, and Trdat I, in fact, did not establish them, but rather, put them in order, reformed them, and unified their rule (3). The majority of these *gawar's* represented historically complex territorial units, regions isolated geographically (given the mountainous terrain of Armenia) and they already existed in the Urartian period (4).

The family names of the *naxarars* in the majority of cases coincide with the names of the *gawar's* returned to their rule, and came into use in application to a particular clan only after the office of *naxarar* became not only hereditary, but connected with one and the same *gawar'*. The emergence of *naxarar* landholding furthered this. Originally in the form of a grant of income (tax) received from this or that village situated on royal land, in practise the grant was a reward for service rendered, and was in addition to the support or salary received from the treasury (5). Such grants, (which did not bind the *naxarar* with any obligations, since income from these villages was received fully by the *naxarar* and thus was beyond [royal] control) were transformed into unconditional landholds (6). This *naxarar* landholding form practised within the *gawar's* gradually began to displace royal landholding and prevailed in the 4th-5th centuries.

[52]

However, in this period, the right of supreme ownership, evidently, was juridically reserved for the king as we may conclude from the account in P'awstos (VI.19) treating the confiscation of lands ruled by the Kamsarakan clan and their addition to the *ostan*.

The emergence of *naxarar* power and landholding is associated with royal policy even in the compositions of 5th-century authors. According to P'awstos (IV.61) the patriarch Nerse's, admonishing the *naxarars*, reminded them that they received all their power from the Arsacid kings, and that it was exclusively thanks to the king that they became lords of districts (*gawar'ateark'*), of large *awans*, villages (*giwghk'*) and *dastakerts*. According to the vivid characterization given Nerse's by P'awstos, "all the *naxarars* were raised from the rubbish heap by the Arsacid clan" (1).

A grant of land was recorded in the royal archive, while the *naxarar* was entrusted with a special certificate, confirming his right of rule or ownership. P'awstos, in relating the tale about bishop John (VI.10), speaks about *murhak'*, signed and sealed by the kings, [confirming] rule over villages (*giwghk'*) and *agaraks*). The term *murhak* is a borrowing from Parthian: *murhak* < Parth. *muhrak* (from *muhr*, "stamp").

In the period under discussion, from a territorial standpoint, royal landholding was very significant. The districts of Ayarat, Kogovit, Hashtank', Aliovit, Goxt'n, Arber'an, Aghdznik', and Tayk', were considered royal land, or *ostan*. Royal too, in its principal part, was the district of Vaspurakan (2), which included a number of *naxarardoms*. The name of this district, Vaspurakan, Parth. *vāspuhrakān* (3), belonging to the *vāspuhr*, i.e., in this case, to the Arsacid crown-prince, possibly attests the fact that this district was given in rule to the Arsacid crown-prince (4).

Lands which entered the composition of the Armenian state as a result of warfare also were royal, subject to the king's administration, while taxes from such lands went into the royal treasury. Xorenats'i (II.6) has preserved a

clear example of this in the story of the annexation of Tayk' by Artashes I (2nd cent. B.C.). Artashes I constructed his summer residence in the depths of Tayk' [53], made two hunting parks in wooded places, "transforming that hot country, Kogh, into vineyards and flower gardens," ordered the population "to obey the royal command and to pay taxes to the royal treasury," and left overseers there. From the quotation of Xorenats'i just cited, it is clear that Tayk', known as the clan district of the *naxarar* house of Mamikonean, originally had no connection with that family and was simply a district of the fisc. It is interesting that Xorenats'i says nothing about Tayk' belonging to the Mamikoneans. According to his account (II.81), the latter for a long time had no definite dwelling-place. The holdings which the Mamikoneans subsequently received in Taron (4th cent.), were, prior to the instituting of Christianity in Armenia, temple-owned (1).

Also belonging to the royal family was the district of Kogovit with the fortress of Daronk, where the royal treasures were stored (PB, IV.1, p. 191); after the fall of the Arsacids this district passed to the Bagratids (2). [The district of] Tsaghkotn with the city of Zarehawan, and Bagrevand with Bagawan also should be mentioned.

It is known from a statement of P'awstos (V.18, p. 217) that the district "Angeghtun in ancient times was *ostan* and its inhabitants were taxed," *i.e.*, were saddled with royal taxes. P'awstos notes that both the district (*ashxarn*), *i.e.*, the land, and the very residents of the district were taxed (*bnakich'k' gawar'in ew ink'eank'*). Possible this passage contains an allusion to the land tax, *bazh*, and a head tax. The district of Aghdznik' (Arzanene) likewise was royal *ostan* (MX, I.30). In Syriac sources of the 5th-6th centuries, the city of Arzn was styled *ostan*, and also "House of Ostan" (3). Possibly this territory—an *ostan* formerly in the period of its entrance into the structure of the Armenian state—after passing to Sasanian Iran, was viewed by the Sasanids as directly a royal district. Apparently Mtsbin (Nisibis) was in the same position. The father of the martyr Givargis (Mihran-Gushnasp) was *ostandar* in Mtsbin (4).

The separation of lands from the royal land fund for the purpose of founding new cities (5) was a practice widely utilized in the Hellenistic period by Armenian rulers in the interest of strengthening the politico-economic base of the slave-holding Armenian state.

[54]

Although information regarding the internal composition of Armenia in the Hellenistic period is extremely scanty, it is nonetheless possible on the basis of what data we do possess to speak about the prevailing importance of royal landholding, long-since surpassing in its extent other types of landholding.

With the growth of feudal relations, the extent of land held by the slave-holding Armenian state diminished. *Naxarar* landholding was greatly strengthened at the expense of sharply reduced royal and city lands. Prior to this, its role had been very limited.

Taxes levied on income from *awans* and villages (*she'n, giwgh*), located on royal lands as well as income from royal *dastakerts* went entirely into the treasury. All taxes collected from villages are termed by Xorenats'i *masn ark'uni*, "royal portion/share" (1). When gifting or selling land, a private individual gave or sold that same "royal share" of the tax [*i.e.*, the obligation to pay the "royal share" passed to the new owner—R.B.]. We have no information of any kind regarding the alienation of peasants, individuals not of slave status.

The individual holding the highest office in the administration of state revenues was the *hazarapet* (Ir. *hazāropat*, a "Thousander" (2). In P'awstos (IV.2) the *hazarapetut'iwn* is characterized as "concern for the well-being of the country" (*ashxarhashe'n, ashxarhatats', ashxarhate's*, and the *hazarapet's* power extended over the entire landholding population (*dehkanut'iwn*). This department already had been introduced by the Achaemenids and under them bore a military-financial character (3). The institutions which controlled the incoming taxes—the chiliarchate in the government of the Seleucids, as well as the *hazarapetut'iwn* in Armenia—were both heirs of the Achaemenids (*hazārupat* = *χίλιάρκος* [*chiliarchos*]) (4).

In Sasanian Iran, too, the office of *hazārapet* existed (it is twice mentioned in the Paikuli inscription), however, it already had a different character, having become fused with the office of grand vezir (*vazurg framatar*). The identity of the two offices under the Sasanians is confirmed by Eghishe' (5). The fiscal functions of the

hazarapet passed to the *vāstryōšān sardār*, "the overseer of farmers" and to the *Ērānšahr amārkar*. In Armenia, the office of *hazarapet* preserved its original nature, right up to the 5th century A.D.

Thus, the sources at our disposal provide us with the possibility of establishing not only the presence of large royal landholding in Armenia, but the predominant character of this particular form in the period under discussion. It is likewise clear that the landowning population, which lived on royal land and payed taxes into the royal reasury, also had an obligation of labor (6). This status was *i harki tsar'ayut'ean* (7) (*servitio vectigalis*), according to the Armenian sources.

[55]

Without a doubt, the farming population was not of one sort. The majority was composed of peasant-communalists, *shinakans*, inhabitants of the *she'ns* and *giwghs*, of the country. Together with the villages there existed large landed estates, the so-called *dastakerts* or *agaraks* (2), worked by the labor of slaves settled there.

The question about forms of administration and of economic control of the extensive Χώρα βασιλική [*chōra basilikē*] (royal land) in the Hellenistic states of Nearer Asia still remains unclear due to the scantiness of historical documentation. Recently, a step forward was made in the work of the Polish scholar T. Zawadzki (3).

According to this scholar's view (reinforced by the inscription of Mnesimach from Asia Minor and by the inscription from Baytokayk (4) in northern Syria) within the Seleucid state there existed a system of entrusting to a private individual in conditional ownership important complexes on royal land. This system, in Zawadzki's opinion, goes back to Achaemenid times and was practised, evidently, only on a part of the royal land, through it was a widespread phenomenon. The estate received by Mnesimach in conditional ownership was a rather large complex comprising 5 villages (κῶμαι [*kōmai*]), farms (αὐλή [*aulē*]) and plots (κλήροι [*klēroi*]). From this extensive estate there were allotted to the chiliarchs Pite and Adrast: a farm in Tobalmur(ax) with homes (οἰκίαι [*oikiai*]), peasants (λαοί [*laoi*]), and the slaves (σικέται [*siketai*]) found directly within its boundaries and 2 gardens (παρადεισοί [*paradeisoi*]) on 15 *artabs* of sowing, and in Periasasostr(ax), farming plots (οἰκόπεδα [*oikopeda*]) on 3 *artabs* of sowing and gardens on 3 *artabs* of sowing, together with the slaves living in that locality. In the inscription it states that from the village, plots and farm plots attached to it from the peasants living there and from wineskins a yearly tax (φόρος ἄργυρικός [*phoros argurikos*]) was paid to the chiliarch, while the (φόρος λητουργικός [*phoros lētourgikos*]), a labor obligation went, evidently, to the "house of the king" (5), for the rates of the taxes are stipulated in detail for each year which the sum was paid to the chiliarch. From the plots allotted to the chiliarchs and from the direct producers, the peasants and slaves living there, no tax went to the royal treasury; consequently, the income from them went directly to Mnesimach; this is the so-called ἑξαίρηματα (*exairēmata*), exceptional tax. It should be noted that this entire complex was not subject to division. Mnesimach, for example, experiencing financial difficulties could not use as a security just part of [the territory] allotted to him, for that part was given conditionally and connected with the obligation of organizing administration and control over the entire complex, fully. If the economy was neglected and the tax was [56] incorrectly paid, Mnesimach could be stripped of all his rights on the part of the estate entrusted to him. Giving to the temple of Artemida in Sardax this entire estate in return for taking from the temple gold as a security, he was in fact transmitting to the temple his right of conditional rule of this complex, together with his obligations (1).

Such a system of transferring royal lands to the administration of a private individual—which comported with that individual's personal interests—must have greatly relieved the governmental apparatus, leaving to it merely fiscal functions, since the very collection of taxes from the villages and *kleroi* was part of the duties of the conditional ruler; it remained for the institution merely to check on the correctness of their receipt, and to tally them, leaving to the conditional landholders the organizational-economic functions. Such a form of administering royal land must have comprised one of the specific features of Eastern governments of the time, [states] whose territorial extent and geographical conditions (physical relief) made very difficult the organization of the administration of royal lands directly under the king's [private] administration, since for that, maintenance of a huge staff of officials would have been required.

It would be natural to expect to find in Armenia a form of administering royal land resembling that described above, the more so since Armenia comprised part of both the Achaemenid and Seleucid governments. Unfortunately, for Armenia there are no documents such as the Greek inscriptions from Sardes and Hosn-Suleiman. Rather, there is only indirect information found in ancient Armenian literary monuments, to allow us to make an analogy between the situation of the ancient Armenian *ostanik's* and Mnesimach.

Two passages from Movse's Xorenats'i's *History of Armenia* are essential sources on the Armenian *ostan* and the *ostanik's*. In II.7, Movse's Xorenats'i states: "And (Vagharshak) initiated four regiments for guarding the court, each of which consisting of 10,000 armed (men) who were of the ancient clan of the king, descended from our ancestor Hayk, properly called *ostan*, (men) who at various times received from fathers hereditarily villages (*giwghk'*) and *dastakerts*. Subsequently, as I have heard, under Persian rule, regiments were formed of other people and named *ostan*—I do not know why, be it from the extirpation of the former clan, or [perhaps] they were wiped out as a result of some battle. In any case, their place was occupied by other regiments under the designation "royal" (*ark'uni*). However, they were first defined as originating from the clan of the first kings just as, until now, in the country of the Ibers are the so-called *sephets'uls*." In the second passage, Xorenats'i states: "It is also said, that after concluding these matters, Tigran as king sent his sister, Tigranuhi, with a numerous suite to Armenia, to an *awan* which Tigran constructed and named after himself, Tigranakert; and he ordered that the district adjoining it be given to her in service. The *azats* [dwelling] in these places, as people of royal descent, are called *ostan*, and as he says (2), they (the *azats*) are descended from her (Tigranuhi's) family. Anush, the first wife of Azhdahak and his numerous daughters, together with youths and many captives, whose number exceeded 10,000, he settled [in an area stretching] eastward from the great mountain as far as the borders of Goght'n, *i.e.*, in Tambat, Voskioghay, Dazhgunik and in other *dastakerts*, one of which was Vrandzhunik', [*dastakerts*] lying along the bank of the river up to the fortress of Naxchawan, plus three *awans*, Xram, Jughay, and Xorshakunik' on the other bank of the river, (and, similarly) the whole plain, starting at Azhdanakan and running to the same fortress of Naxchawan (were given to her)" (I.30).

[57]

As is clear from the quotations cited, Movse's Xorenats'i regarded the *ostanik's* as representatives of the royal clan, descendants of the legendary Hayk. This conception of Xorenats'i's, albeit with reservations, has been accepted as true by several investigators, for example, G. Inchichean (1) and N. Adontz. According to Adontz, the main body of *ostanik's* consisted of representatives of the Arsacid house; however, he admits that subsequently individuals, receiving from the Arsacids landholds in the district of Ayrarat as a gift for special services, also were included among the *ostanik's*. After the fall of the Arsacids, former court officials were included in the category of *ostanik's* (2).

H. A. Manandyan, arguing with Adontz, arrived at a more correct interpretation of the *ostanik's*, [seeing them] as free landowners dwelling on royal lands and not having any kinship ties with the dynasty. However Manandyan, too, fell under the influence of Xorenats'i's conception, in its most unstable spot. Manandyan attempted to find a germ of rationality in Xorenats'i's account of the Haykid origin of the *ostanik's*. [In his opinion,] "The *ostan*, or royal land, were those principal districts of Armenia where the ruling Indo-European tribe which had arrived [in Armenia] was situated in numbers"; and, arising from this hypothesis, Manandyan proposed seeing in the *ostanik's* descendants of the Indo-European Armens. In the light of his own hypothesis about the Indo-European origin of the *ostanik's*, he regarded as especially likely that part of Xorenats'i's testimony, which speaks of the complete replacement of the *ostanik's*, allegedly implemented by the Sasanids for strengthening their political rule in Armenia (3). But when considering testimony from Xorenats'i, one should not lose sight of a feature characteristic of this author, namely, his attempt not only to state one or another fact but also, when possible, to provide explanations. Xorenats'i frequently has recourse to semantic analysis of a term, based on popular etymology, especially when explaining phenomena in periods far removed from his own (4).

Literally, *ostanik'* means "court, royal," and individuals of that category ruled over villages and *dastakerts* located on land which was formerly royal. From this, naturally, Xorenats'i made his conclusion about their royal origin (5). However, those *ostanik's* whom Xorenats'i himself was able to see, living at the turn of the 5th-6th centuries, had nothing in common with the royal house, as was obvious to a contemporary. To explain this fact, Xorenats'i has introduced his version according to which the *ostanik's* originally were of royal descent, but then

they either died out or were directly annihilated and fully replaced by the Sasanians with other people from various clans.

Ostanik's lived solely on royal land. According to one source (6), they were representatives of the ruling class, receiving from the king rule over villages and *dastakerts* on the territory of the *ostan*. [58] However, since the entire peasantry of the *ostan* was paying taxes into the treasury, since the sources contain no allusions to a ceding by the king to the *ostanik'* (in contradistinction to the *naxarars*) of taxes collected for villages and *dastakerts*, since the status of such lands remained royal and unchanged, one may conclude that lands located on the Χώρα βασιλική [*chōra basilikē*] were granted only for conditional hereditary tenure, their owner remaining the king. Of course, in the estate of the *ostanik'* there must have been *ἐξαιρήματα*, farms, allotments, and plots with slaves the income from which belonged fully to the *ostanik'*. The absence in the sources of information about this is accounted for by the fact that the sources relate to a later, already feudal, period when the position of the *ostanik's* was undergoing fundamental changes.

It is interesting that in the List of Ranks (*Gahnamak*), the *ostanik's* are called *spasawork'* (servants) of the *ostan*.

The *ostanik's*, unlike the *naxarars* at a relatively late time, were very closely connected with the royal power and constituted the fundamental part of the royal cavalry. In the 4th-5th centuries, in the period of active struggle between the ever-strengthening *naxarardom* and the slave-holding government of the Armenian Arsacids, the latter relied on the royal army, principally composed of *ostanik's*. Even in the period of the Marzpanate, the *naxarar* troops are contrasted with those troops assembled from the *ostanik's*. This feature—military service—apparently was the specific difference between *ostanik's* and the conditional rulers of royal land in Seleucid times; in any case, we have no information about the latter's military service. Perhaps this circumstance is tied to the fact that the Seleucids made wide use of the services of mercenaries.

Certainly the process of feudalization hurt the *ostanik's* too, and it is fully possible that in the 5th-6th centuries they were already "feudal landholders" (as H. A. Manandyan calls them), living on formerly royal land; however, this was but the final stage in the course of their development. They began as conditional rulers of royal land of the type that Mnesimach belonged to.

Notes

The links in the citations below are to the resources at Internet Archive.

[44]

(1) N. Adontz, Армения в эпоху Юстиняна *Armeniia v epokhu Iustiniana* [*Armenia in the Period of Justinian*], (St. Petersburg, 1908), p. 463. [In the English translation by Nina G. Garsoian (Lisbon, 1970), this quotation is on p. 352. See also later in that section, pp. 359-361--RB.]

(2) H. Hübschmann, *Die altarmenischen Ortsnamen* IF, XVI (Strasbourg, 1904), pp. 460-461 [an Armenian translation of this work also is available: Հին հայոց տեղւոյ անունները]; and the same author's *Armenische Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1897), I, s. v.

[45]

(1) H. A. Manandyan, *Notes on the Condition of Shinakans in Marzpan Armenia* (Erevan, 1925) pp. vii-xiii (in Armenian); Manandyan, Ֆեոդալիզմը հին Հայաստանում [*Feudalism in Ancient Armenia*] (Erevan, 1934), pp. 57-58 (in Armenian).

(2) N. Adontz, *Historical Researches* (Paris, 1948), p. 168 (in Armenian).

(3) *Ōstān shād i Bahman* included four territorial units—*tasuqs*. See Tabari in Th. Nöldecke, *Geschichte der Perser und Araber zur Zeit der Sassaniden* (Leiden, 1879), [p.13](#).

(4) J. Marquart, *Eranshahr nach der Geographie des Ps. Moses Xoranic'i* Abh. d. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen, phil-hist. Kl. NF, III, #2 (Berlin, 1901), [pp 21-23](#).

(5) [The *Geography*, which was formerly was attributed to] Pseudo-Movse's Xorenats'i, 31 (see J. Marquart, *op. cit.*)

[46]

(1) F. Andreas, W. Henning, *Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch Turkestan*. III SPAW, 1934, p. 861, C 25-27; 'ndr 'wyst'm 'yhwest'n u šhryst'n cy byl'b'd... "in der Provinz Chuzistan und in der Provinzhauptstadt Belabad..."; SPAW, 1933, p. 331 #729, VI, 9, C 41: 'wyst'm "Provinz" (but in an abstract sense).

(2) The text of the *Law-Book* is cited after the edition of S. J. Bulsara, *The Laws of the Ancient Persians* (Bombay, 1937) in the transcription and translation [[volume 1](#)]; [[volume 2](#)] of the author of the given article. [R.B: Bulsara's material has been replaced by Perikhanian's own improved text and translation, from the *Book of a Thousand Judgements* (a Sasanian Law-Book), by Anahit Perikhanian, translated from Russian by Nina Garsoian (New York, 1997).]

(3) It is possible that this practise arose as a result of a shortage of workers in the royal households/farms.

(4) In the ms. one ideogram [non-reproduced ideogram-R.B.] is damaged and there is a lacuna.

[47]

(1) Compare MHD, IV _{x+5}, *VDI*, 1952 #4, p. 16.

(2) According to Tabari, the *ōstāndār* of Ispahan commanded an army against the Arabs (Marquart, *op. cit.*, [p. 30](#); Nöldecke, *op. cit.*, [p. 448](#)).

(3) After the fall of the Sasanian government, the *ōstāndār* of Tabaristan started an independent dynasty in Tabaristan, minting money bearing the legend "*ōstāndār*" (Marquart, *op. cit.*, [p. 133](#)).

(4) M. I. Rostovtzeff and C. B. Welles, "A Parchment Contract of Loan from Dura-Europos on the Euphrates," *YCS*, II (1931) pp. 1-78.

(5) See his review in *Philologische Wochenschrift*, 1933 September, pp. 266-270.

(6) J. Wolski, "Parthian and Iranian Titles in the Parchment #10 from Dura," *JJP*, VII-VIII (1953-1954), [p. 292](#).

[48]

(1) According to the *Vita Gallieni*, Odenathus and his son were *Augusti*, but this is not confirmed by the legends on coins.

(2) Philostratus (*Vita Apoll.*, I.27) mentions a Parthian official in Babylon—ὁ σατράπης ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν μεγάλων πυλῶν [*o satrapēs o epi tōn Megalon pulōn*]. J. Wolski (*op. cit.*, pp. 287-290) equates this title with Manes' third duty/office, reconstructed by K. Mlaker as παρ[απα]της [*par[apa]tēs*], Ir. *pahrakpat* "chief of the guards." It seems to me more correct to see in *o epi tōn Megalon pulōn*, a literal translation of the term *ōstāndār* (the primary meaning of the term *ōstān*) is "gate, threshold," whence the equation of this term with the Supreme Porte). He is also styled "satrap" not by accident, as Wolski suggests, but rather, for a fuller disclosure of this term, as defining a ruler of a specific territory who was designated by the king. Incidentally, the reconstruction

of Manes' third office as *παρ[απα]της* [*par[apa]tēs*], *pahrakpat* "chief of the guards" arouses doubt, since this was too insignificant an office for such an important official. Parthian *pahrak* "guard" in classical Armenian also has the special meaning "obligatory labor, the duty of obligatory labor." In the ancient Armenian translation of the New Testament, Greek *ἀγγαρεύω* [*aggareuo*] corresponds to Armenian "*parhak unel*" or "*taraparhak varel*". It is possible that in the given case too, under *pahrakpet* we should understand "overseer of the department of labor duty," from the fact that Armenian *parhak* is a loan word from Parthian (in any case, the/a northern form). But this is very problematical since in Manichaean texts *p'hrgbyd* means "overseer of the guard" (see C. Salemann, *Manichäische Studien*, 27, *Mém. Ac. Imp. St.-Pétersbourg*, Cl. phil.-hist sér., VIII, #10 (1908), Gloss., p. 108, C1).

(3) Also possible are *ὠστανδάρων* [*ōstāndāron*] and *αὐστανδόρων* [*austandarōn*], since in Iranian initial *o* is long (from *avi-*).

[49]

(1) For a correct understanding of this place see the conjecture of Markwart (*op. cit.*, [pp. 23-24](#)).

(2) Mahkert-tun = Syr. Bēth Mahqart, subsequently a diocese of the eparchy of Arbela; Dasn = Bēth Dāsen, a diocese of the same eparchy.

(3) A. G. Perikhanian, *Sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoe znachenie xramovyx ob'edinenu Maloi Azii i Armenii v IV v. do n.e.-IV v n.e.* (Leningrad, 1955) (*avtoreferat dissertats'ii*).

(4) G. X. Sarkisyan, *Gorod drevnei Armenii* (Leningrad, 1953) (*avt. dis.*); Sarkisyan, "Gradostroitel'stvo v Armenii pri Tigrana II i vopros o pereselenii chuzhestrants'ev," *Uzv. Arm. SSR*, 1955 #2, pp. 43-64; Sarkisyan, "Iz istorii gorodskoi obshchiny v Armenii," *VDI*, 1955 #3, p. 48 ff.

(5) Adontz, *op. cit.*, [pp. 451-472](#) drew attention to the fact that [the term] "*naxarar*" was an administrative, not clan designation [English translation: [p. 342 ff](#)].

[50]

(1) W. B. Henning, "A New Parthian Inscription," *JRAS*, 1953, fasc. 3-4, [pp. 132-136](#).

(2) *gry'rthštr*, "*naxvadar* and satrap." The word in front of the title indicates either the name of a district which was ruled by the individual shown in the painting (by analogy with *šwš xšsatrap* in the Parthian inscription from Susa (W. Henning, "The Monuments and Inscriptions of the Tang-i-Sarvak," *Asia Minor*, II, 176), or, the name of that official.

(3) For one reference to the office of *naxadar* from Iran proper, we might cite the name of the Persian commander Nohadares, encountered in Ammianus Marcellinus; the first to turn attention to this, P. Andreas, correctly linked it with Armenian "*naxarar*" (see Hübschmann, *Arm. Gramm.*, II, [p. 514](#)). At the beginning of the 14th chapter of the *Frahang i Pahlavīk* is the term [non-reproduced Pahlavi ideogram-R.B.] *nax^var* from *nax^vǰbar*, which H. Junker, *Frahang i Pahlavīk* (Heidelberg, 1912), p. 37 regards as absolutely identical to Arm. *naxarar*, deriving, in his opinion, from Old Persian *nax^vabara-*. But the transition of Ir. *-bar* into Arm. *-rar* is irregular. Identical to the Armenian form *nax^vār* would be *naxawor*. And, in fact, this form is encountered in the Armenian abstract noun *naxaworut'iwn* "chiefdom, *naxarardom*, rule." Both terms (*nax^vǰbar* and *nax^vadar*) are independent, and are synonyms.

(4) H. Pagnon, *Inscriptions sémitiques de la Syrie, de la Mésopotamie et de la region de Mossoul* (Paris, 1907), insc. #5. The editor translates this: "commandant militaire de Choud" in accordance with the definition provided in the dictionary of Bar-Baxlul, but the source of the latter ("the etymologist") is unknown. The term has been preserved also in the geographical designation Beth Nōhādrē, a Nestorian diocese in the Mosul area—see Thomas, Bishop of Marga in E. A. Wallis Budge, *The Book of Governors, the Historia monastica of Thomas*,

Bishop of Marga (London, 1893), I, [pp. 104-105](#) pp. 104-105. [*Book of Governors by Thomas of Marga A. D. 840: volume 1*, Introduction and Syriac Text (London, 1893), in 626 pdf pages; [volume 2](#), English translation (London, 1893), in 746 pdf pages.] Recently, the inscriptions which mention this title have been published—see J. B. Segal, "Some Syriac Inscriptions of the 2nd-3rd Century A.D.," *BSOAS* (1954), [pp. 21-22](#).

(5) So believes W. Tarn, *The Greeks in Bactria and India* (Cambridge, 1951) pp. 1-3, 113, 240-241. Seleucid satrapies were divided into eparchies which, in their turn, were divided into hiparchies. When the Seleucid kingdom collapsed, only the subdivision into eparchies was preserved since, from the standpoint of administrative units, the eparchies were more suitable. Satrapies embraced huge territories separate parts of which were connected by neither geography, economics, nor ethnicity. New kingdoms arising in place of the Seleucid monarchy as, for example, Parthia and Bactria, retained the eparchy, which now became the largest administrative unit of these countries and which was called a satrapy.

(6) Avr. I^{a,b}, 6-7, E. Minns, *JHS*, XXXV(1915).

[51]

(1) Pliny, *NH* VI.10: Armenia dividitur in praefecturas, quas strategias vocant, quasdam ex his vel singula regna quondam, barbaris nominibus CXX.

(2) N. Adontz, *op. cit.*, [pp. 433-434](#) [English translation: [p. 331 ff](#)].

(3) According to Movse's this reform is attributed to Vagharshak, into whose character two historical individuals have been merged: Artashes I (189-160 B.C.) and Tiridates I (53-100 A.D.). In view of the fact that the term *naxarar* is a Parthianism in classical Armenian, the systematization of this institution took place, doubtlessly, under the Parthian Tiridates I, under whom this term also was, evidently, introduced officially on the Parthian model; in the first half of the 2nd century B.C., when Artashes I ruled, the young Parthian government had not yet spread its power to the western regions of Iran and Mesopotamia bordering Armenia.

(4) For example, Mekk', Tayk', R'shtunik', Mardanali, Tsop'k', Sper, Korduk in which are reflected the names of various tribes populating these regions toward the beginning of the 1st millennium B.C.

(5) According to Movse's Xorenats'i (II.53), Artashes gave as a gift to Smbat Bagratuni income from the village of Goght'n. However, nowhere in the sources is there further reference to Bagratid landholding in Goght'n, although there is rather detailed information about the holdings of this clan in other districts. Possibly, at first the income from the lands was given for the lifetime [of the recipient] and was not transmitted hereditarily.

(6) The gifting of land with full ownership rights also took place in the government of the Seleucids but only under condition of adding the gifted land to some *polis*—see the Laodice inscription, C. B. Welles, *The Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period* (New Haven, 1934) #18-20. In the Armenian sources there are no allusions to the addition to a *polis* of lands gifted to a *naxarar*. Apparently in ancient Armenia private land ownership emerged outside the bounds of the *polis*. The fictive sale (actually, the gifting) of land to Laodice, was compensation for divorce. This custom was followed in Hellenistic Armenia also (see MX, I.30).

[52]

(1) The official viewpoint of partisans of royal power also is partly enunciated in this statement.

(2) J. Markwart, "Die Genealogie der Bagratiden," *Caucasica* (1930) fas. 6, pt. 2, p. 35. Large royal landholds, controlled by the *mardpets*, were located in Taron—see A. Garagashean, *Critical History of Armenia*, II (1895), [p. 7](#), [p. 20](#) (in Arm.) and J. Marquart, *Südarmenien und die Tigrisquellen* (Wien, 1930), p. 26.

(3) Reference to the Armenian district of Vaspurakan is first encountered in Strabo (XI.5) in the distorted form of Βασοροπεδαν [*Basoropedan*], instead of Βασπορακαν [*Basporakan*], H. Kiepert *Lehrbuch der alten Geographie* (Berlin, 1878) #82 and J. Markwart, *Ērānšahr...*, [p. 108](#). H. Hübschmann, however, believed that

[the form] Vaspurakan could have appeared in Armenia only in the period of the Marzpanate, in the 6th century at the soonest, since according to a known law of phonetics, Parthian *vāspuhrakan* would give in Armenian **vaspurhakan* or **vaspuhakan*; the Armenian form reaching us suggests a Sasanian transmission (H. Hübschmann, "Zur Chronologie der armenischen Vokalgesetze", *Sprachwissenschaftliche Abhandlungen hrsg. von d. Patrubany*, I, fas. 8 (Budapest, 1898), p. 143; Hübschmann, *Altarmenische Ortsnamen*, pp. 261-263. The appearance of a district belonging to a *vaspuhr* in the Marzpanate period is not confirmed by any historical foundation. Perhaps the Sasanian influence on the Armenian form was secondary?

(4) Evidently as in Iran, where the territory around modern-day Isphahan is named VispuhrΘkān. Compare the Nakš-i Rostem inscription, 6: *Ispahān i VāspuhrΘkān* (E. Herzfeld, *Paikuli*, I, B., 1924), *andarzpat i VāspuhrΘkān* (*Bezenberger Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen*, IV, p. 62) (*Karnāmak*), and also in Sebeos (III. 6, 13): *vaspurakan hamarakar* in Isphahan.

[53]

(1) According to legend, the Mamikoneans were settled in Taron and in the fortress of Oghakan on the Euphrates, allegedly belonging to the Silkuni clan. Not far from Oghakan, at a ford, the village of Sulux was located. N. Adontz, *op. cit.*, p. 310 [English translation: p. 244], suggests that Xorenats'i's attribution of this territory to the Silkuni clan derives from the etymological similarity of the name Silkuni with the name of the village Sulux. However, the name at the base of this family name, evidently, is simply a Syriac rendition of the Greek name Selenk.

(2) N. Adontz, *op. cit.*, p. 307 [English translation: p. 242], proposed that the Bagratids from antiquity lived in Bagrevand which supposedly was their initial clanal district. However, the similarity between the terms Bagrat and Bagrewand, on which he bases his proposal, is not confirmed by philological analysis.

(3) See J. B. Chabot, *Synodicon orientale ou recueil des synodes nestoriens* (Paris, 1902), pp. 272, 274, 285, 366, and 617.

(4) G. Hoffmann, "Auszüge aus syrischen Akten persischer Märtyrer," *Abhandl. für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, VII (1880), #3, pp. 92-93. N. Adontz considered the fact of the existence of *ostan* [lands] in Mtsbin and Arzn to speak against the treatment of this term as "royal land," whereas [that fact] only confirms the correctness of such an interpretation of the term.

(5) On city-building, see S. G. Eremyan, "Razvitie gorodov i gorodskoi zhizhni v drevnei Armenii," *VDI* (1935) #3, pp. 11-31, and G. X. Sarkisian, *Gorod drevnei Armenii* (1954) (*avtoreferat dissertatsii*).

[54]

(1) MX II.53: Artashes gives Smbat "the royal share" in the *shens* of the district of Goght'n and in Uxtu-akunk; II.22: Artavazd gives to his brother and sister, in hereditary rule, "the royal share" in *shens* of the district of Aghiovit and Arberan, stipulating simultaneously maintenance (*rochik*) and a separate income from the treasury. See also MX II.8.

(2) In the Classical Armenian translation of the New Testament, *hazarapet* renders Greek οἰκονομος [*oikonomos*] (I. Corinth., IV.1) and χιλίαρχος [*chiliarchos*] (Mark, VI.21).

(3) See Xenophon, *Cyropaedia*, VIII, 1,14.

(4) Taxes were received in the chiliarchate as the known Asia Minor inscription of Mnesimach attests—W. H. Buckler, D. M. Robinson, "[Greek Inscriptions from Sardes, I](#)," *AJA*, XVI (1912), pp. 11-32; W. E. Prentice, "[The Mnesimachus Inscription at Sardes](#)," *ibid.*, pp. 526 ff.

(5) In Eghishe', Mihrnerseh, the "great vezir" of Yazdigerd, is called *Mihrnerseh vzrk hramatar eran ew aneran* (20.5); in 22.7: *mets hazarapet arik' ew anarik'*.

(6) For example, *xashar* on construction works, see P'awstos Buzand, III.8. From the given context in P'awstos, under *xashar* we might also understand "obligation."

(7) PB, V.18. From this, evidently, arose the expression *i tsar'ayut'iwn arkanel*, literally, "to throw into service," meaning "to impose taxes," see Eghishe', *Vardan...* (Venice, 1852) pp. 38-39 (in Arm.).

[55]

(1) On the village commune in ancient Armenia see H. A. Manandyan, "Aktual'nye voprosy istoriografii drevnei Armenii," *Istoriik-marksist* (1940) #6, p. 7; S. T. Eremyan, "Osnovnye cherty obschestvennogo stroia Armenii ellinisticheskoi epokhi," *Izv. AN Arm. SSR* (1948), 11, pp. 45-52.

(2) That *dastakert* (= *dzer'akert*) and *agarak* were different names for the same type of land rule (the first, borrowed from Parthian; the second, local) is clear from the fact that in the sources these two terms are nowhere used side by side: in enumerating the different types of settlements, only one of them was used. The difference between the condition of those settled on *dastakerts* and the communalist-peasants was so great, that in juridical relations they continued to be felt even in the 12th century A.D.—see Mxit'ar Gosh, *Law Book II*, 1. On the *dastakerts* and the means of exploiting the slaves settled there, see A. G. Perikhanian, *VDI* #4(1952), pp. 14-20.

(3) T. Zawadzski, "Z zagadnień struktury agrarno-apolechnej krajów matoazjatyckich u epoce hellenizmu," *Trudy istoricheskoi komisii* (Poznan, 1952); see the historical question there and the bibliography.

(4) C. B. Welles, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period* (New Haven, 1934) #70.

(5) See A. Ranovich, *Ellinizm i ego istoricheskaya rol'* (M.-L., 1950), p. 155.

[56]

(1) Certainly there must have existed set norms, guarantees [of protection] from the king's arbitrariness; otherwise the transaction with the temple would have been impossible.

(2) Xorenats'i here is citing the Syrian, Mar-Abas.

[57]

(1) G. Inchichean, *Historical Description of Armenia* (Venice, 1835), II, pp. 132, 133, 160-162 (in Arm.).

(2) N. Adontz, *op. cit.*, pp. 476-479 [English translation: p. 359 ff]; compare also his *Historical Investigations*, p. 172.

(3) Manandyan, *Remarks...*, pp. XII-XIII.

(4) See, for example, about Kamsar (II.87), on the Gnt'uni clan (II.7); on the "Chinese" origin of the Mamikoneans (II.81).

(5) And, in this case, the association arising in MX with the Georgian *sepets'uls* "relatives of the king" is fully comprehensible.

(6) Eghishe' (Venice, 1854), pp. 18, 160: "and many other *azats* from royal land, who were called *ostanik's*."
